

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion.

Claims 201-234 are currently pending in the application. Claims 201-213, 216, 219-225, 231, and 232 are amended by way of the present response.

Initially, Applicants express thanks for the Examiner's allowance of Claims 226-230, 233, and 234.

Applicants express further thanks for the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 209, 210, 221, 223, and 232, such that the objected to claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In response, the claims have been so-rewritten. Thus, in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, the allowance of Claims 209, 210, 221, 223, and 232 is requested.

Applicants submit that, contrary to section 1 of the Office Action, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) has not been filed in this application.

Regarding the objection to the claims, Applicants have amended Claims 213 and 216 in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Thus, it is requested that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections of independent Claims 201-204, it is asserted that neither Mizuno nor Haneda discloses or renders obvious the claimed features of a holder including at least three projections extending from one end of an image carrier comprising a handle, such that at least two of the projections touch a surface on which the image carrier is disposed when the image carrier is removed from an image carrier unit. Specifically, it is asserted that Figure 3 of Haneda shows the actuate gap retention members 106 and 107, each of which would at most contact a surface on which the photoreceptor drum 10 is disposed at a single point. In addition, the photoreceptor drum 10 does not comprise the now recited handle.

For these reasons, the allowance of independent Claims 201-204 is requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 205, 207, and 211, it is asserted that Mizuno does not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of one of developing and cleaning devices or means configured so as to be unable to be dismounted from an image carrier unit until an image carrier or means has been dismounted from the image carrier unit. Specifically, it is asserted that Mizuno does not depict or describe a cleaning device, and does not depict or describe that such a cleaning device or the charging brush 22 are unable to be dismounted from the photosensitive body cartridge 3 until the photosensitive body drum 2 is removed.

For these reasons, the allowance of independent Claims 205, 207, and 211 is requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 206, 208, and 212, it is asserted that Mizuno does not disclose or render obvious the claimed features of an image carrier or means configured so as to be unable to be mounted to an image carrier unit until a cleaning device or means has been mounted to the image carrier unit. Specifically, it is asserted that Mizuno does not depict or describe a cleaning device, and does not depict or describe that the photosensitive body drum 2 is unable to be mounted to the photosensitive body cartridge 3 until such a cleaning device is mounted.

For these reasons, the allowance of independent Claims 206, 208, and 212 is requested.

It is asserted that independent Claim 219 is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claims 201-204. For these reasons, the allowance of independent Claim 219 is requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 220, it is asserted that neither Mizuno nor Haneda discloses or renders obvious the claimed features of a developing device

configured to be dismounted from an image carrier unit before a charging device and after the image carrier is dismounted from the image carrier unit. Specifically, it is asserted that Mizuno does not depict or describe a developing device dismounted after an image carrier is dismounted.

For these reasons, the allowance of independent Claim 220 is requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 222, it is asserted that neither Mizuno nor Haneda discloses or renders obvious the claimed features of a developing device configured to be dismounted from an image carrier unit after a charging device configured to charge the image carrier. Specifically, it is asserted that Mizuno depicts the developer cartridge 5 removed prior to removal of the photosensitive body cartridge 3 that includes the charging brush 22.¹

For these reasons, the allowance of independent Claim 222 is requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 224, the independent claim recites a developing device configured to be separated from an image carrier unit in a unit including an image carrier before a unit including a cleaning device and a charging device. It is asserted that Nagase does not disclose or render obvious these features, however, as Nagase does not depict or describe the developer units 31 (Y, M, C, and K) including the photoreceptor drum 10, and therefore does not depict or describe a developing device configured to be separated in a unit including an image carrier. Further, inasmuch as the cartridge C of Nagase may be characterized as analogous to the claimed features of a unit including a developing device, the cartridge C includes both the photoreceptor drum 10 as well as the cleaning unit 19, such that the photoreceptor drum 10 and the cleaning unit 19 are separated from the image forming apparatus at a same time, and therefore Nagase does not

¹ Column 4, lines 36-45.

depict or describe a unit including an image carrier separated from an image carrier unit before a unit including a cleaning device and a charging device.

For these reasons, the allowance of independent Claim 224 is requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 225, the independent claim recites an image carrier configured to be separated from an image carrier unit before a developing device, a cleaning device, and a charging device. It is asserted that Nagase does not disclose or render obvious these features, however, as in Nagase the cartridge C includes both the photoreceptor drum 10 as well as the cleaning unit 19, such that the photoreceptor drum 10 and the cleaning unit 19 are separated from the image forming apparatus at a same time. Therefore, Nagase does not depict or describe an image carrier configured to be separated from an image carrier unit before a cleaning device.

For these reasons, the allowance of independent Claim 225 is requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 231, the independent claim recites a cleaning device configured to be separated from an image carrier unit before a charging device and after the image carrier. It is asserted that Nagase does not disclose or render obvious these features, however, as in Nagase the cartridge C includes both the photoreceptor drum 10 as well as the cleaning unit 19, such that the photoreceptor drum 10 and the cleaning unit 19 are separated from the image forming apparatus at a same time. Therefore, Nagase does not depict or describe a cleaning device configured to be separated from an image carrier unit after an image carrier.

Claims 213-218 are allowable for the same reasons as independent Claims 211 and 212 from which they depend, as well as for their own features. For these reasons, the allowance of dependent Claims 213-218 is requested.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in

Application No. 10/728,896
Reply to Office Action of March 4, 2005

condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 201-234 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421

GJM/RTP/MQM/kkn
I:\ATTY\MQM\24's\245150US\AM 7-04-05.doc